

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-6, and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,313,208 to Kavenik ("Kavenik"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,503 to Gietema et al. ("Gietema"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The examiner contends that Kavenik discloses an audio entertainment and information system for the cabin of a commercial passenger aircraft. Further, the examiner states that Kavenik discloses several lamps, each connected to the aircraft's power source for the purpose of illuminating the cabin interior. The audio entertainment and information system for the cabin includes a radio frequency audio transmitter which transmits audio signals through an exposed antenna system 16, located in the side wall of the cabin, to be received by the passengers. Headsets are provided to the passengers, whereby the headsets are directly connected to a means for receiving the audio signals transmitted by the transmitter.

However, by the examiners own admission, Kavenik does not disclose the placement of transmitters in a lamp assembly, the connection of the transmitters to the audio source and the transmitters adapted to receive information from analog or digital audio source. For these features, the examiner cites Gietema, which the examiner believes discloses a system for



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 4 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

concealing antenna systems in a lamp chamber and that the antennas of Gietema transmit the audio information through the lens of the lamp chamber.

A careful reading Gietema will reveal that Gietema discloses the concealment an antenna within a pole like object or shaft, not a lamp chamber. (Column 4, lines 28-30; column 6, lines 62-65; column 7, lines 52-59). Figure 1b of Gietema discloses an antenna 13 located within a pole of a lamp. Additionally, Figure 1b also shows that a radome 6 (containing a satellite dish or horn dish) can be located above the pole or above the lamp itself (but not inside the lamp chamber itself). (Column 12, lines 35-37).

Claim 1 recites of a transmitter located within the lamp chamber, the transmitter adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber. Gietema only discloses a radome 6 that can be located either above the pole of the lamp or above the lamp itself (column 12, lines 35-37). Unlike as required by claim 1, Gietema does not disclose placing the transmitter within the lamp chamber.

Additionally, Gietema does not disclose that the transmitter is adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber. Since the radome 6 contains a satellite dish or a horn dish, any transmitted signals emitted by the enclosed satellite dish or horn dish are transmitted upward, towards an orbiting satellite. Lamps, especially street lamps, are adapted to project visible light downward to the ground. A lens is located beneath the lamp to allow light emitted by the lamp to radiate downward, while also protecting the lamp from environmental harm. Since the radome 6 of Gietema emits signals upwards and away from the lens, it is submitted that Gietema does not



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 5 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

disclose the element of a transmitter being adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the chamber.

In that neither Kavenik or Gietema disclose or suggest (1) a transmitter located within a lamp chamber and (2) the transmitter being adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber, it must be concluded that the combination of Kavenik in view of Gietema cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to the remaining claims, these claims are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectively requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 3, 2007

Date


John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57,414)



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 6 -